DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 855 PS 017 482

AUTHOR McNamara, Thomas
TITLE Some Recommendations for the Next Generation of Early Childhood Programs in Philadelphia. A Position Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Programs; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Policy; Futures (of Society); *Models; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Social History
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)

ABSTRACT

This three-part paper develops a position on early childhood education in Philadelphia that is based on historical development and policy analysis. Reference points used throughout the discussion are Guba's (1984) concepts of policy-in-intention, policy-in-action, and policy-in-experience. Part 1, which focuses on the past, briefly reports on the history of the city's program efforts and highlights the policy implications of those efforts. Attention is given to cultural forces, values, and moral considerations relative to the city's early childhood history. Philadelphia is shown to have been a national leader in every type of early childhood activity. Sub-topics include developmental and academic philosophy, and the wide range and effectiveness of the programs. Part 2, which concerns the present, employs material from the professional literature to put developments in a broader context. The evidence indicates that the city continues to provide comprehensive coverage while at the same time being responsive to new demands, data, and policies. Particular attention is given to the alignment of Philadelphia's practices with the emerging model of effective early intervention. With a view toward the future, part 3, discusses six recommendations for the city's future early childhood programs and indicates benefits to be derived from a new early childhood structure. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297855

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT GENERATION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS IN PHILADELPHIA

A Position Paper
by
Thomas McNamara

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas
Mc Namara

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

November 1987

PS 017482

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT GENERATION OF
EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS IN PHILADELPHIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I.

I. THE PAST: PHILADELPHIA A NATIONAL LEADER IN EVERY TYPE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD ACTIVITY

A. The Wide Range of Philadelphia's Programs 3

B. The Developmental/Academic Philosophy of Philadelphia's Programs 5

C. The Effectiveness of Philadelphia's Programs 6

PART II.

II. THE PRESENT: PHILADELPHIA CONTINUES ITS COMPREHENSIVE COVERAGE WHILE BEING RESPONSIVE TO NEW DEMANDS, NEW POLICIES

A. The Response to New Data/New Policies 12

B. Philadelphia's Practices Reflect the Emerging Model of Effective Early Intervention 15

PART III.

III. THE FUTURE: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR, AND THE BENEFITS TO BE DERIVED FROM A NEW EARLY CHILDHOOD STRUCTURE IN PHILADELPHIA 18

Recommendation A. New K-3 Small-Class Structure at All 60% AFDC Sites 19

Recommendation B. Full-Day Kindergarten/Transition Class at All 45% AFDC Sites 20

Recommendation C. Comprehensive K-3 Curriculum Evaluation Targeted to 60% AFDC Sites 21

Recommendation D. Full-Day Day Care Centers at All 60% AFDC Sites 22

Recommendation E. School Board's Health Initiative Linked to Day Care Operation 23

Recommendation F. School District to Become Day Care Prime Contractor at All 60% AFDC Sites 23

REFERENCES 25

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT GENERATION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS IN PHILADELPHIA

INTRODUCTION

This is an attempt to develop a position on Early Childhood Education in Philadelphia that is based on historical development and policy analysis. Its goal is, first, to put Philadelphia's present program efforts in context with a brief overview of Philadelphia history in this area, while simultaneously highlighting the policy implications of these activities. Secondly, it will use statements in the professional literature to give still broader context to developments in Philadelphia. And, finally, it will attempt to deduce from all of the above a set of recommendations for the future of Early Childhood Programs in Philadelphia.

The paper will check the occurrence of Guba's (1984) different policy types in the history of Early Childhood programs in Philadelphia and in the thinking in the professional literature. His "policy-in-intention" (goals, decisions, guidelines, and sets of tactics); "policy-in-action" (expectations, norms, and effects); and "policy-in-experience" (policy as perceived/experienced by program participants) - see e.g., Guba (1984) p. 65 - will be reference points throughout. The paper also represents the outcome of a somewhat similar form of introspection as that in which Bronfenbrenner, Kessel, Kessen, and White (1986) engaged regarding developmental psychology:

> ...Kessen's opening theme - the problematic status of the notion of "development" - receives almost complete assent in the course of the discussion. Even more noteworthy, he, Bronfenbrenner, and White are of generally like mind regarding its various close corollaries - the child or, more specifically, our conceptions of the child are cultural inventions (or constructions); developmental psychology is itself a cultural invention (or construction); the conceptions and activities of the community of developmental psychologists are embedded in, and shaped by, larger cultural forces; and discussions of "development" and the praxis of developmentalists are inherently linked to values and to moral considerations (p. 1227).

The paper, although not concerned with the level of complexity involved in discussing the nature of "development" per se, or in providing improved direction for the future of all of developmental psychology, nevertheless feels it is bound to address in some meaningful way the "cultural forces" and "values" and "moral" considerations relative to Early Childhood's history in Philadelphia. In short, the paper feels responsible for the kind of examination of history, current activity, research data, themes from the professional literature, and the consequent explicit or implicit policy commitments, that would produce well-reasoned recommendations for the future of Early Childhood in Philadelphia. It deals, in order, with the main topics: a) Philadelphia's past history as a national leader in comprehensive Early Childhood programs, b) Philadelphia's present efforts to continue its historical commitment while responding to pressing current needs, and c) what seems most reflective of that historical commitment in the design of a new generation of Early Childhood programs.

PART I

THE PAST

I. THE PAST: PHILADELPHIA A NATIONAL LEADER IN EVERY TYPE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD ACTIVITY

A. The Wide Range of Philadelphia's Programs

Schweinhart and Koshel (1986) recently presented information on the variety of prekindergarten options currently available to school districts around the country. This kind of overview of services offered in today's market serves to highlight the wide range of early childhood programs - not only at the pre-K level - which have been the hallmark of Philadelphia's interest in and commitment to this age level since the end of the last century. The following chronological list of the city's early childhood activities is enlightening:

1. Philadelphia established Kindergartens systemwide in the 1870's.
2. A Child Care program - pre-K and K; low to middle SES - was established under the first Impact Aid Act during World War II in the mid-1940's.
3. Parent Cooperative Nurseries - pre-K; middle to low SES - were begun in the mid 1950's.
4. Philadelphia's initial Head Start Program (Get Set) - pre-K; low income children - began in the mid-1960's as part of the first wave of the Great Society's Head Start operations. But Get Set became "Get Set Day Care" when funding shifted to Social Security auspices in the late 1960's.

5. The National Follow Through program - poverty level children; K-3 - made Philadelphia its largest single site, with seven instructional models represented, in the late 1960's.

6. The new approach to Head Start, i.e., Prekindergarten Head Start (Planned Variation Head Start) - pre-K; poverty level children - became a major part of Philadelphia's early childhood efforts in the mid-1970's.

7. By the mid 1970's there were also created local adaptations of Follow Through (K-3), based on Philadelphia's two most successful models, Behavior Analysis and Bank Street, and funded either under Title I (Chapter 1) - Project Success - or the operating budget (Primary Skills).

8. Two other major schoolage programs were established by Philadelphia in the mid-1970's as part of its overall early childhood operation, both programs targeting at-risk students: a) Checkpoint, an operating budget program for underachievers in Grs. 1-3; and b) Benchmark, a Title I/Chapter 1 program for the lowest achieving students in Grades 4-6 in schools in high-risk areas of the city.

Philadelphia's programs, then, have spanned and gone beyond all the usual ranges of early childhood activities, and have anticipated by many years Scarr and Weinberg's (1986) recommendation to arrange for operations where programs with a day care

emphasis could coexist with and complement those with an early education emphasis. The underlying philosophy of early childhood education in Philadelphia and its "policy-in-intention", "policy-in-action", and "policy-in-experience" also evolved and converged in a clear-cut direction, as will be discussed in the following.

B. The Developmental/Academic Philosophy of Philadelphia's Programs

It has been almost a quarter of a century since the basic interventionist convictions of Bloom, Bruner and Hunt began to be the predominant paradigm in early childhood education in this country, and it is hardly a misconstrual of history to assert that compensatory education, since its major emergence in the Great Society era, is close to being synonymous with intervention. There are still some followers of Arnold Gesell and his admonitions to let each child's development occur in its own good time, and there are those who argue that to understand Piaget is to reject intervention, but by and large an interventionist approach receives the most frequent approbation. Among the interventionists, however, there are those who insist that intervention be minimal, that only in this way can it be respectful of the natural occurrence of Piagetian stages; and there are those who take a much more active stance regarding intervention. Philadelphia has given every evidence, at least since the mid 1960's and its whole-hearted participation in the Great Society programs, that its philosophy and most clearly articulated policies regarding Early Childhood Education are grounded in active, structured intervention convictions.

School District of Philadelphia philosophy and policies, then, are at odds with Elkind (1986):

> The miseducation of young children, so prevalent in the United States today, ignores the well-founded and noncontroversial differences between early childhood education and formal education...Sound early childhood education is an extension of the home, not of the school. (Elkind, 1984, p. 636)

The School District is convinced that there is a clear need for early structured intervention, especially for young children whose home life is one characterized by severe poverty and its consequences. The School District is further convinced that this kind of structured intervention can be as aware and respectful of developmental stages and developmentally appropriate activities as the approaches promoted by the most dedicated Piagetians.

Philadelphia's programs have a very good record of effectiveness under this philosophy and policy commitment, as can be seen in the following.

C. The Effectiveness of Philadelphia's Programs

The effectiveness of Philadelphia's programs is first documented at the prekindergarten level through yearly data based on administration of the Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC). This 150+ item, standardized checklist is used for systematic observation of all prekindergarten children by teachers in programs affiliated with the School District, and provides information on developmental status in seven major areas: 1) Gross Motor, 2) Fine Motor-Manipulation, 3) Fine Motor-Writing, 4) Self-Help, 5) Social Development, 6) Cognitive Development, and 7) Language Development. The DBC has been used consistently for more than seven years, and a recent study of two cohorts in two of the prekindergarten programs

(Get Set Day Care and Prekindergarten Head Start) found it had good predictive power for later school success and/or problems.

In addition to reporting current developmental status for prekindergarten children, the School District routinely tracks all prekindergarten program "graduates" K-12, and long-term effects studies based on citywide test data show the following:

1) Parent Cooperative Nursery graduate cohorts (entering Kindergarten groups) have been tracked through Grade Eight, i.e., 9 cohorts have entered Kindergarten; 8 have entered First Grade, etc. through 1 cohort which has reached Eighth Grade. This program for middle and low income children - with mandated parent involvement a half-day each week - has the following record of achievement: On citywide tests, 100% of all the cohorts exceeded national norm expectations (i.e., in terms of expected percentages at/above the national 50th percentile) - usually by a large margin - across all the grade levels in Mathematics; and 91% of the cohorts exceeded national norm expectations - again, usually by a large margin - across all the grade levels in Reading; the few remaining cohorts have never had less than 40% at/above the national 50th %ile in Reading at any grade level. The level of accomplishment seems at least to some degree related to the mandated parent involvement and socioeconomic status of the families.

2) Child Care graduate cohorts have also been tracked through Grade Eight - 8 cohorts have entered

Kindergarten, 7 have entered First Grade, through 1 cohort which entered Eighth Grade. The achievement record for this program for low to middle income children is as follows: More than 80% of all the cohorts equaled/exceeded national norm expectations across all the grade levels in Math; and close to 2/3 of the cohorts equaled/exceeded national norm expectations across all the grade levels in Reading. Extremely few of the remaining cohorts have had less than 40% at/above the 50th %ile at any grade level in either of the two areas. The level of accomplishment of this program also seems related to the socioeconomic status of program participants.

3) Get Set Day Care graduate cohorts have been tracked through Grade 11, i.e., 12 cohorts have entered Kindergarten; 11 have entered First Grade, through 1 cohort which has entered Eleventh Grade. Get Set is a program for low income children and has the following record of achievement: In Math, across Grades K-3, 98% of the cohorts have equaled/exceeded national norm expectations; most cohorts have had at least 40% at/above the national 50th %ile in Grades Four and Five. In Reading, across Grades K-2, 82% of the cohorts have exceeded national norm expectations; many cohorts have had at least 40% at/above the national 50th %ile in Grade Three. Though there are no specific explanations available, the decline in upper grade performance may be related to the

possibility that basic skill proficiency in the early grades is not attaining the level of automaticity required to readily handle upper grade content.

4) Prekindergarten Head Start graduate cohorts have also been tracked through Grade 11, i.e., 12 cohorts have entered Kindergarten; 11 have entered First Grade through 1 cohort which has entered Eleventh Grade. Prekindergarten Head Start is a poverty level program and has achieved as follows: In Math, across Grades K-3, 90% of the cohorts have equaled/exceeded national norm expectations, many cohorts have had at least 40% at/above the national 50th %ile in Grades Four and Five. In Reading, across Grades K-2, 82% of the cohorts have equaled/exceeded national norm expectations; a number of cohorts have had at least 40% at/above the national 50th %ile in Grade Three. The decline in upper grade performance for graduates of this poverty level program may be a function of the same possibility offered above for Get Set.

In addition to the above achievement information, two separate cohorts of Get Set Day Care and Prekindergarten Head Start graduates were recently studied at Grades Four and Five to determine rates of retention in grade and assignment to Special Education (as well as the predictive power of the DBC, as already noted). It was found that graduates of these two programs had notably less incidences of grade retention and assignment to Special Education than other students in the system.

Among schoolage programs, in the heyday of Follow Through (mid-to late-1970's) the Behavior Analysis Model was consistently high performing K-3, usually equaling or exceeding national norm expectations in Math across this range and always being at least in the high 40% range at/above the national 50th %ile in Reading across these grade levels. The model received national validation as an effective program by the JDRP (Joint Dissemination Review Panel of the National Institute of Education and the Office of Education) in the late 70's. Among recent schoolage programs, the Primary Skills Program, which is an operating budget spinoff of Follow Through has a record of many years of equaling/exceeding national norm expectations in Reading and Math K-2, and has given evidence most recently, when the program was extended to Grade Three, of gradually being able to achieve at this level in both areas at this grade level. Among Non-Follow Through schoolage programs, the Benchmark Program, which is a Chapter 1 program for the lowest achieving (usually below national 16th %ile) students in Grades 4-6, has consistently shown that it can upgrade minimum functioning levels of the basic skills capability of these students as measured by both criterion-referenced and national norm-referenced instruments.

The School District's Early Childhood philosophy and policies, then, have produced achievement results comparable to other nationally cited data (see e.g., Schweinhart and Mazur, 1987), and add further support to High/Scope's studies regarding the cost-benefits of prekindergarten programs. The cost-benefits of prekindergarten have been made a key part of the nationally

recognized Committee for Economic Development's (CED) proposals.

CED report staff, Doyle and Levine (1985), state:

> Successful preschool education programs give participants significantly better chances for success in later life.
>
> The trustees responded to this finding as they would to a business proposition. They concluded that it costs society more not to intervene than it costs to do so (p. 118).

Philadelphia's past policies have worked well, as shown above, and have so far proven themselves compatible with all the new demands and policy changes initiated by the most recent reform reports, as discussed below.

PART II

THE PRESENT

II. THE PRESENT: PHILADELPHIA CONTINUES ITS COMPREHENSIVE COVERAGE WHILE BEING RESPONSIVE TO NEW DEMANDS, NEW POLICIES

A. The Response to New Data/New Policies

Hodgkinson (1985) caught everyone's attention recently with his analyses of demographic trends that produced conclusions like the following. The schools will soon face more children who:

- were premature at birth
- were born to a teenage mother
- were born to parents who were not married
- come from single parent households
- come from "blended families" that result from remarriage of one original parent
- come from poor households
- are minorities
- have not participated in Head Start or similar preschool programs
- have working parents and could be described as latch-key children

The nation's governors in their report, Time for Results, were certainly responding to projections like these, and Governor Riley of South Carolina who headed the Task Force on Readiness Recommendations, reported proposals of the following nature (Riley, 1986):

1) Provide in-home assistance for first time, low-income parents of high-risk infants...

2) Develop outreach initiatives that use community and religious organizations to assist young children whose only sources of nurturance are absentee parents or guardians...

3) Provide kindergarten for all 5-year-olds...

4) Provide high quality developmental programs for at-risk 4-year-olds (and, where feasible, 3-year-olds)...

5) Provide all interested parents of preschool children with information on successful parenting practices...

6) Stress the continuing improvement of developmental and educational programs in day-care centers for preschool children. This includes improving staff development and in-service training, and providing for accreditation of (or similar standards for) day care centers.

7) Develop state and local structures through which all agencies work together to provide appropriate programs for young children and their parents (pp. 215-217).

Boyer (1987) also concluded from the clear message of data like Hodgkinson's (1985) that:

> ...If failure is not to become a way of life for many urban youths, we must recognize that poverty and schooling are connected...We must give top priority to early education, especially to language... (p. 5)

And Howe's (1986) reaction to this kind of forecast is to argue for "a national political leader who has an agenda for children", and to stress the need for continually examining "the agenda of our national government through the lens of the needs of children and families" (p. 196).

At the same time, Halpern (1987) analyzed all the recent trends in our society, especially as regards young poor children, from a somewhat different perspective. His conclusions:

1) Families with young children are increasingly dependent on agencies outside their informal social networks...

2) Our sense of collective responsibility for other people's children, never strong to begin with, is deteriorating further.

3) The stress on parents of trying to provide both adequate economic support and adequate care and nurturance for children is likely to intensify.

4) We as a society face the urgent task of renewing and redefining our social contract with each other, and with young families in particular; the early childhood care and education community has a central responsibility with respect to this task (p. 34).

These trends and recommendations signify the need for a wide range of policy changes at all levels of government, changes that the governors of the various states of this country recognize the need for and support, as Riley (1986) has indicated.

The realization that poverty affects schooling, that poor families are under increasing stress, and that the earliest possible intervention is called for, has been all too clear to the School District for many years, and in many respects underlies its present policies, which have their roots twenty years ago in the early days of compensatory education. Some policy variations seem particularly appropriate for the School District at this juncture, however, and these will be addressed in the final section related to recommendations for the future.

For the present the School District is basically responding to the increasing demand from outside for attention to early childhood by maintaining its already far-ranging efforts, and, as funding allowed, it has also tried to enlarge its scope of activities. It has continued, then, to operate as many of its existing, comprehensive early childhood services as it could, and to the fullest extent possible, but it has also phased in new initiatives, e.g., 1) a Transition Program, operating in almost 70 sites, essentially for those with persisting developmental problems in the early elementary years, 2) Full Day Kindergartens at more than 100 sites to allow time for full implementation of the Kindergarten

curriculum and the time for a full range of developmentally beneficial experiences, and 3) an Early Intervention and Transitioning Child program to provide special services to handicapped prekindergarten children. These new programs are targeted for regular evaluation efforts, and reports regarding their effectiveness will be available soon.

At the same time, the citywide testing program now includes a developmental dimension in the form of brief, standardized screening checklists K-2, which are used throughout the system to identify and document students seriously at risk developmentally so that early, preventive measures may be directed toward their needs. This emphasis on development was considered an important move to make in its own right, as well as provide the means for the School District to satisfy its responsibilities after the Frederick L. decision.

All of the above considerations and experiences make Philadelphia more and more a participant in the emerging theory of the "bonding" and "linking" effects of early intervention and schooling.

B. Philadelphia's Practices Reflect the Emerging Model of Effective Early Intervention

Philadelphia's data, experience and logic allow it to combine its existing policy convictions regarding the need for consistent, structured, preventive intervention as soon as possible for low-income children, with the growing, parallel policy trends outside, and to relate the sum total of these policy forces to the kind of "bonding" explanation Schweinhart and Weikart (1986) give in

discussing their High/Scope "causal model that 'links' short-, mid-, and long-term preschool effects:

1. Poor children who attend a good early childhood development program are better prepared for school, intellectually and socially.

2. A better start in school helps children achieve greater school success, as demonstrated by a decreased need for attending special education classes or repeating a grade.

3. Greater school success leads to greater success in adolescence and adulthood as demonstrated by lower rates of delinquency, teenage pregnancy, welfare, and unemployment" (p. 7).

This same kind of "bonding" phenomenon was the subject of discussion by Copple, Cline and Smith (1987) when they stated:

> ...Perhaps Head Start children learn skills for dealing more successfully with the school environment. Teachers are likely to be favorably impressed, for instance, when children are cooperative, task-oriented, responsive to feedback, strong in self-help skills, or active in class participation (p. 24).

Coleman (1987) argues for the need for "bonding" effects from a different point of view, noting the loss of families' "social capital" ("the norms, the social networks, and the relationships between adults and children that are of value for the child's growing up" p. 36). This loss of "social capital" in Coleman's mind argues for a new form of child care (to be further addressed in the next section):

> The general shape of the demand for a new institution is clear: It is a demand not for further classroom indoctrination, nor for any particular content, but a demand for child care <u>all day; from birth to schoolage; after school, everyday, till parents return home from work; and all summer</u> (p. 38).

The School District's philosophy - and policies - of structured, preventive intervention synchronize completely with the bonding model of early intervention. There has to be a total

complex of specially designed early educational experiences for most students from very low income backgrounds. If they do not receive this kind of help, the prospects are not good that they will be able to profit from school, to participate in and contribute to principals' necessary vision for effective schools (see e.g., Sheive and Schoenheit, 1987), and later on to avoid the serious difficulties many adolescents experience.

The final section, following, extends the line of thought in the preceding parts to what are considered logical conclusions and recommendations for the future.

PART III

THE FUTURE

III. THE FUTURE: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR, AND THE BENEFITS TO BE DERIVED FROM A NEW EARLY CHILDHOOD STRUCTURE IN PHILADELPHIA

There are almost daily statements from federal, state, and local government sources; there are new legislative proposals; there have been many position statements from business interests regarding the need for early intervention. One of the most recent statements from the latter sector was made by David T. Kearns, the President of the Xerox Corporation, as reported in the New York Times (Oct. 27, 1987):

> (Kearns) criticized the Federal Government for not spending more on research and education of the disadvantaged. He advocated doubling the spending on Head Start and a remedial program for poor children to $10 billion to $12 billion a year.

A large part of this new, universal interest in early childhood education has taken the form of promoting "school for 4-year-olds", and there is renewed emphasis on full-day kindergartens.

Furthermore, while early intervention is usually synonymous with pre-K in the minds of most recent promoters of early childhood education, the National Head Start Office is more and more convinced that prekindergarten alone cannot provide enough "cure" for poverty level children and is about to propose its own "transition" program - Follow Through by another name and with a "new start" (see e.g., Copple, Cline, and Smith, 1987, p. 27). The Follow Through "concept" has, in fact, always remained intact as a logical follow-up for low income children. Zigler (1987), for example, has long maintained the conviction: "We simply cannot inoculate children in one year against the ravages of a life of deprivation" (p. 258). And Hebbeler (1985) concludes her study with a statement she considers only a restatement of

what Susan Gray, one of the early architects of Follow Through, had concluded many years previously:

> Future funding for preschool programs can benefit and apparently has benefited from demonstration of program effects, and that may be good for preschool programs such as Head Start and subsequently for poor children...However, these same children may suffer in the long run if policymakers are left believing that the provision of early education has now taken care of the effect of poverty on academic achievement. Yes, it works for some children, but the problems of the rest of them are still with us (p. 216).

Given this interest and these positions on what is needed in early childhood, this seems an ideal time to bring together the following considerations: a) the consistently evolving School District policy of structured, preventive intervention, that dates back to the mid-1960s, b) the recent, widespread interest in and proposals for early intervention advanced by all levels of government and spokespersons from the private sector, c) the School District's current priorities: Instruction, Child Advocacy, and Regulatory Reform, and d) the current recognition of the need to revive the Follow Through "concept", if not the Follow Through name. Several recommendations that can perform this linking role are offered:

Recommendation A.

That a new K-3 structure be established in all high-risk elementary sites (e.g., defined as having 60%+ AFDC), funded under 1) new, transition-focused Head Start operations, and 2) special-waiver Chapter 1 and Special Education proposals, and having a) all small classes (15 max.), b) a teacher, a full-time aide, and a parent scholar in each class, and c) using an approach based on the most recent findings in the effective schools/effective instruction literature.

It seems clear from all the above statements that while intervention at the prekindergarten level is a necessity for poverty level children, there is increasing admission once again - as in the days of early Follow Through - that pre-school intervention is often not enough. There has to be continued intervention at the early elementary level. The transition-focused Head Start funds appear to be a clear possibility in the near future. The proposed use of special-waiver Chapter 1 and Special Education funds for this purpose is exactly what the School District's Regulatory Reform Committee has recommended, based on the thinking of e.g., Heller, Holtzman and Messick (1982):

> (there is) little empirical justification for categorical labeling that discriminates mildly mentally retarded children from other children with academic difficulties (p. 87),

and the recommendations of Wang, Reynolds and Walberg (1985):

> This initiative involves, first, the joining of demonstrably effective practices from both special education and general education to establish a coordinated educational delivery system that is more inclusive and better serves all students, including special-needs students (p. 8).

The 60% AFDC condition seems appropriate in its own right and because it would coincide with the proposed criterion for Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects in the new reauthorization.

Recommendation B.

That all the above sites, and all other schools with at least 45% AFDC rates have all full-day kindergartens and a transition class (present School District form).

This is a logical extension of Recommendation A in terms of providing every possible form of prevention in those 60% AFDC sites, and then seems recommended as a logical horizontal extension to those neighboring 45% AFDC sites which should have at least this minimum level of preventive efforts.

Recommendation C.

That a comprehensive evaluation of curriculum implementation and effectiveness be conducted, targeting the K-3, 60% AFDC sites, so that it can be accurately determined to what extent, and under what circumstances, the proportion of students performing on grade level in all major areas at each of these grades, and especially at the end of Third Grade, is increasing.

In conjunction with the concentrated programmatic efforts included in Recommendations A and B above, it seems very important to systematically examine - at least in a well-chosen, stratified sample - how well the Standardized Curriculum is being implemented K-3 in typical 60% AFDC sites. Furthermore, it is of great importance to clarify what effect results from good implementation in terms of ultimately increasing in a major way the percentage of students entering Fourth Grade who can function at grade level in all major areas. There are many experimental and theoretical grounds for the conviction that most students who arrive at Fourth Grade on grade level have a chance of deriving maximum profit from the rest of their schooling.

Recommendation D.

That the School District work with local business - and also make use of any available government or other agency support - to make each high-risk (60%+ AFDC) elementary site a full-day, and full-fledged day care center for infants, toddlers, preschool, and schoolage children.

This is a logical extension of the thinking of experts like Coleman (1987) and Zigler (1987), already cited, but it is also a proposal that would allow schools to become more directly and consistently involved with PL99-457, which extends support for early intervention down to the level of infants and toddlers, and to become the kinds of cooperative/coordinating agencies Riley (1986) envisioned, i.e., the means of encouraging and arranging for families to take advantage of all pre-natal care and any other needed service provided under EPSDT (Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment), as well as the means of providing parent training and serving as child care centers for teenage parents. This kind of operation would, then, make the schools direct partners in dealing with the problems Wang and Yancey recently highlighted (see Mezzacappa, May 31, 1987):

> By 1990, more than half the students in urban school systems like Philadelphia's will be "special needs" students qualifying for either special education or programs for disadvantaged students...
>
> Many of the students will fall into more than one of those categories, said Dr. Margaret Wang, director of Temple University's Center for Research in Human Development and Education...
>
> Her projections were buttressed by a Temple study of public school students in Philadelphia, which showed that their health has a measurable impact on their performance in school...

> The health factor is in addition to the possible adverse effects of poverty, lack of family stability, and race on a student's achievement, said William L. Yancey, director of Temple's Institute of Public Policy Studies...

Recommendation E.

As a corollary to Recommendation D above, that all planned health initiatives in the School District be given the highest priority in order to minimize as quickly as possible the major health deficiencies presently affecting Philadelphia's students.

The School District is currently planning a number of curricular and programmatic initiatives to combat school problems arising largely from poor health or circumstances conducive to poor health. It seems critical that these initiatives, including the Growing Healthy project in District 8, go forward in addition to planning for a comprehensive health dimension in the day care operation proposed in Recommendation D.

Recommendation F.

That the School District begin negotiations to become a Prime contractor rather than the actual agency for the delivery of the day care services outlined in Recommendation C, and, apart from Head Start operations (which would anchor the schoolage transition program referenced in Recommendation A), seriously consider something on the order of a ten-year plan to phase other Pre-K program staff into the new K-3 schoolage operation outlined in Recommendation A to have sufficient personnel for this extensive effort.

This last recommendation seems reasonable in light of the fact that large-scale day care operations would be called for which seem best left to existing agency providers, while the School District would assume the coordinating role of prime contractor. Similarly, additional School District personnel would be required to staff the new, intensive K-3 emphasis, and most existing pre-K staff in non-Head Start programs could be reassigned to the early elementary level, thus reducing considerably the need to hire additional personnel.

As a concluding statement, it is important to note that these recommendations are not proposed as exhaustive possibilities, but only those which seem to rise to the forefront when considering a natural future for the School District's long-standing commitment to a policy of structured, preventive early intervention.

REFERENCES

Boyer, E. L. (1987) Early schooling and the nation's future. Educational Leadership, 44(6) 4-6

Bronfenbrenner, U., Kessel, K., Kessen, W., and White, S. (1986) Toward a critical social history of developmental psychology. American Psychologist, 41(11) 1218-1230

Coleman, J. S. (1987) Families and schools. Educational Researcher, 16(6) 32-38

Copple, C. E., Cline, M. G., and Smith, A. N. (1987) Path to the Future: Long-Term Effects of Head Start in the Philadelphia School District, Wash., D. C.: Head Start Bureau, U. S. Department of Health and Human Services

Doyle, D. P. and Levine, M. (1985) Business and the public schools: Observations on the policy statement of the Committee for Economic Development. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(2) 113-118

Elkind, D. (1986) Formal education and early childhood education: An essential difference. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(9) 631-636

Guba, E. G. (1984) The effect of definitions of policy on the nature and outcomes of policy analysis. Educational Leadership, 42(2) 63-70

Halpern, R. (1987) Major social and demographic trends affecting young families: Implications for early childhood care and education. Young Children, 42(6) 34-40

Hebbeler, K. (1985) An old and a new question on the effects of early education for children from low income families. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3) 207-216

Heller, K., Holtzman, W., and Messick, S. (Eds.) (1982) Placing Children in Special Education: A Strategy for Equity. Wash., D. C.: National Academy of Sciences Press

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1985) All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through Graduate School, Wash., D. C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc.

Howe, II, H. (1986) The prospect for children in the United States. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4) 191-196

Mezzacappa, D. (1987) Health tied to success in school. Philadelphia Inquirer, 5/31/87

New York Times (1987) Xerox chief says public schools are hurting U. S., New York Times, 10/27/87

Riley, R. W. (1986) Can we reduce the risk of failure? Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4) 214-219

Scarr, S. and Weinberg, R. A. (1986) The early childhood enterprise: Care and education of the young. American Psychologist, 41(10) 1140-1146

Sheive, L. T. and Schoenheit, M. B. (1987) Vision and the work life of educational leaders. In L. T. Sheive and M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.) Leadership: Examining the Elusive. 1987 ASCD Yearbook, Alexandria, Va.: ASCD, 93-104

Schweinhart, L. J. and Koshel, J. J. (1986) Policy options for preschool programs. High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers No. 5, Ypsilanti, Mich.: High/Scope

Schweinhart, L. J. and Mazur, E. (1987) Prekindergarten programs in urban schools. High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers No. 6, Ypsilanti, Mich.: High/Scope

Schweinhart, L. J. and Weikart, D. P. (1986) Early childhood development programs: A public investment opportunity. Educational Leadership, 44(3) 4-12

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., and Walberg, H. J. (1985) Rethinking special education. Paper prepared for the Wingspread Conference on the Education of Special-Needs Students, Racine, Wisc., Dec. 1985

Zigler, E. F. (1987) Formal schooling for four-year-olds? No. American Psychologist, 42(3) 254-260